

REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicant submits that none of the claims now pending in the application is anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 or made obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3, 6-17, 20-24 26-37, 40-51, 54-58, 60-71, 74-77 AND 79 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6-17, 20-24 26-37, 40-51, 54-58, 60-71, 74-77 and 79 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated the Ziv-EI patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,698, issued October 16, 2001, hereinafter "Ziv-EI"). In response, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79 from which claims 2-3, 6-17, 20, 22-24, 26-34, 36-37, 40-51, 54, 56-58, 60-68, 70-71 and 75-77 depend, in order to more clearly recite aspects of the invention.

Particularly, the Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Ziv-EI fails to disclose or suggest the novel invention of forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts, and forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query, wherein a response to the query includes a completed response template that links a plurality of parts of the structured entity, as claimed in Applicant's independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79. Specifically, the invention claimed by the Applicant forwards a plurality of response templates to a user, where each of the forwarded templates may potentially be used to answer the query. This allows the user to select which template(s) to use for each part of his or her response to the query, as well how many templates together will form the response. Thus, the user has a degree of control over the form in which he or she uses the response templates to answer the query. This facilitates self-explanation of the user's response to the query, for instance wherein the user attempts to deliberately explain a complex concept in a step-by-step fashion.

By contrast, Ziv-EI teaches a method in which a student response to a query is entered into a display that is chosen by the asker of the query. That is, the student

answering the query has no control over the form or manner of his or her response, but is rather “shoehorned” into a dictated response format.

The Applicant’s claims clearly recite that a response to a query pertaining to a structured entity comprises a completed response template that is selected by the user (answerer) from among a plurality of forwarded templates for answering the query. That is, a person answering the query actually selects which response template(s) to use for each part of his or her response, and how many templates together form the response. Thus, the answerer may “index” different parts or relationships of the structured entity. Such a relationship might be, for example, literary foreshadowing and a later direct statement of the previously foreshadowed idea. Ziv-EI, by contrast, teaches that the person posing a query selects a single format for the response. For instance, a display used by a teacher for constructing a query includes a drop-down list for “exercise type” (e.g., multiple choice, question and answer, fill-in-the-blanks, etc.) that results in a different edit window layout (See, e.g., Ziv-EI, column 15, lines 43-53). As illustrated by Figures 9, 11 and 13 of Ziv-EI, the response format (e.g., “template”) is defined and presented to the answerer of the query based on the exercise type. Nowhere does Ziv-EI teach that the answerer may choose the format or template in which to provide his or her answer.

Ziv-EI thus fails to disclose or suggest the novel invention of forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts, and forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query, wherein a response to the query includes a completed response template that links a plurality of parts of the structured entity, as claimed in Applicant’s independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79. Specifically, Applicant’s claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79 positively recite:

1. A method for providing feedback, said method comprising the steps of:
 - a) forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts;
 - b) forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query;
 - and
 - c) receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of said structured entity. (Emphasis added)

21. A method for providing feedback, said method comprising the steps of:

- a) receiving a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts;
- b) receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and
- c) providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of said structured entity. (Emphasis added)

35. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the steps comprising of:

- a) forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts;

- b) forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query;

and

- c) receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of said structured entity. (Emphasis added)

55. A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform the steps comprising of:

- a) receiving a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts;

- b) receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

- c) providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of said structured entity. (Emphasis added)

69. An apparatus for providing feedback, said apparatus comprising:

- means for forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts and for forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and

- means for receiving a response from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of said structured entity. (Emphasis added)

74. An apparatus for providing feedback, said apparatus comprising:
means for receiving a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts and for receiving a plurality of response templates for answering the query; and
means for providing a response to an aggregating device from a first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of said structured entity. (Emphasis added)

79. A system for providing feedback, said system comprising:
a first client device; and
an aggregating device for forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts and a plurality of response templates for answering the query to said first client device, where said aggregating device receives a response from said first client device, wherein said response comprises a completed response template linking a plurality of parts of said structured entity. (Emphasis added)

As discussed, Ziv-El fails to disclose or suggest the novel invention of forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts, and forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query, wherein a response to the query includes a completed response template that links a plurality of parts of the structured entity, as claimed in Applicant's independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69, 74 and 79 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and are patentable thereunder.

Dependent claims 2-3, 6-17, 20, 22-24, 26-34, 36-37, 40-51, 54, 56-58, 60-68, 70-71 and 75-77 depend from claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74 and recite additional features therefore. As such, and for at least the same reasons set forth above, the Applicant submits that claims 2-3, 6-17, 20, 22-24, 26-34, 36-37, 40-51, 54, 56-58, 60-68, 70-71 and 75-77 are not anticipated by the teachings of Ziv-El. Therefore, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-3, 6-17, 20, 22-24, 26-34, 36-37, 40-51, 54, 56-58, 60-68, 70-71 and 75-77 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and are patentable thereunder.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4, 5, 25, 38, 39, 59, 72, 73 AND 78 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 25, 38, 39, 59, 72, 73 and 78 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being made obvious by Ziv-El in view of the Sonnefeld patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,298, issued July 9, 2002, hereinafter "Sonnefeld"). In response, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74, from which claims 4, 5, 25, 38, 39, 59, 72, 73 and 78 depend, as described above in order to more clearly recite aspects of the invention.

As discussed above, Ziv-El does not teach, show or suggest the novel invention of forwarding a query pertaining to a structured entity having a plurality of parts, and forwarding a plurality of response templates for answering the query, wherein a response to the query includes a completed response template that links a plurality of parts of the structured entity, as claimed in Applicant's independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74. Sonnefeld fails to bridge this gap in the teachings of Ziv-El. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

Dependent claims 4, 5, 25, 38, 39, 59, 72, 73 and 78 depend from claims 1, 21, 35, 55, 69 and 74 and recite additional features therefore. As such, and for at least the same reasons set forth above, the Applicant submits that claims 4, 5, 25, 38, 39, 59, 72, 73 and 78 are not made obvious by the teachings of Ziv-El in view of Sonnefeld. Therefore, the Applicant submits that dependent claims 4, 5, 25, 38, 39, 59, 72, 73 and 78 also fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103 and are patentable thereunder.

III. CONCLUSION


Thus, the Applicant submits that all of the presented claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the maintenance of the final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

1/3/07
Date

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702


Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 530-9404